

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 THOMAS M. O'CONNELL (NYSBN 1801950)
Assistant United States Attorney

5 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
6 San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-5053
7 FAX: (408) 535-5066
Thomas.M.OConnell@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

E-FILED - 1/22/07

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. CR 06-00425 RMW
)	
14 Plaintiff,)	
)	STIPULATION AND <input type="checkbox"/>
15 v.)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
)	
16 CHRISTINA MARIE FLORES, and)	
17 JOSE LITO CAMPOS,)	
)	SAN JOSE VENUE
18 Defendants.)	

19

20 On December 11, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status

21 conference. The parties jointly requested that the case be continued from December 11, 2006 to

22 January 8, 2007, at 9:00 a.m. in order for counsel for defendant Campos to review the discovery

23 in his new narcotics case, and consider how this may affect his position with respect to this case,

24 which could also affect the position of Ms. Flores. In addition, the parties requested an

25 exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from December 11, 2006 until January 8, 2007.

26 Defendant Flores, who was present with her attorney, J.A. Hudson, agreed to the exclusion.

27 Defendant Campos, who was present with his attorney Assistant Federal Public Defender

28 Cynthia Lie, also agreed to the exclusion. AUSA Thomas O'Connell also agreed. The parties

agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney

DATED:

/s/
THOMAS M. O'CONNELL
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED:

/s/
CYNTHIA C. LIE
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Counsel for Mr. Campos

DATED:

/s/
J.A. HUDSON
Counsel for Ms. Flores

Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from December 11, 2006 until January 8, 2007. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: 1/22/07

Ronald M. Whyte
RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge